

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected the claims as double patenting over U.S. 6,750,755. Applicants submit that upon indication of allowance of claims in the present application, a terminal disclaimer will be filed.

The Examiner has further rejected Applicants' claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by the teachings of the patent 5,709,303 granted to Best. It is noted that the Best patent teaches a robot having a rotatable pallet mounted at the end of the arm for sequentially locating the plurality of parts disposed on the pallet for operations to be performed at various individual work stations. The parts on the pallet of Best are inspected by video cameras located at the various work stations which, upon detecting a defect in the part, provide a signal to the controller for the robot; and, the robot can then move the pallet vertically to raise or lower a pin provided in the pallet for mechanically indicating a defective part at that particular location on the pallet.

Applicants' method, in contradistinction to the device and the teaching of the Best patent, provides for locating a plurality of members (identifiers), each with an array of holes or apertures correspondingly located to match an array of pins disposed in a base or primary structure over which the identifier is to be assembled. The identifiers in applicants' claim contain detectors on certain ones of the array of apertures to form a discrete pattern or subset of the pins in the primary structure pin array. The controller or computer polls the pins to determine which discrete pattern is matched and thus determines the nature of the identifier which has been assembled over the pins. The discrete patterns in the identifiers are arranged such that if a single pin on the face or primary structure member has more than one identifier received thereover, the remaining discrete pattern of each identifier can only match a corresponding subset of the pin array stored in memory. Thus, applicants' method of polling the pins and determining the presence of which discrete identifier pattern is present over the pins, identifies the presence or absence of the particular identifiers and, thus, whether or not the function associated with the identifier is present or absent.

The device of Best does not determine the presence or absence of pallets by polling the pins. The pins of Best either serve a simple mechanical orientation function as locator pins for the pallet stack; or, a function as data pins to indicate the presence or

absence of a defect at an individual station. Thus, applicants' claims describe a process of determining the absence or presence of a particular identifier in a manner which is patentably distinct from the teachings of Best.

Accordingly, in view of the amendments made herein and for the reasons set forth above, it is requested that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn and the amended claims made the subject of a Notice of Allowance.

☒ Remaining Claims, as delineated below:

(1) FOR	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT LESS HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR		(3) NUMBER EXTRA
TOTAL CLAIMS	3	- 20 =	0
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS	1	- 3 =	0


☒ This is an authorization under 37 CFR 1.136(a)(3) to treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for extension of time, as incorporating a petition for the appropriate extension of time.

☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any filing or prosecution fees which may be required, under 37 CFR 1.16, 1.17, and 1.21 (but not 1.18), or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Roger A. Johnston, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP


Roger A. Johnston, Reg. No. 25,880
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
216-861-5582

December 17, 2007
Date